

NEVADA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of Meeting

November 15, 2006

A meeting of the Nevada County Transportation Commission (NCTC) was held on Wednesday, November 15, 2006, in the City of Grass Valley Council Chambers, 125 East Main Street, Grass Valley, California. The meeting was scheduled for 8:30 a.m.

Members Present: Nate Beason, *Tim Brady, Sally Harris, Patti Ingram, Russ Steele, and *Josh Susman

Members Absent: Robin Sutherland

Staff Present: Dan Landon, Executive Director; Nancy Holman, Administrative Services Officer; Mike Woodman, Transportation Planner; Toni Perry, Administrative Assistant

Standing Orders: Vice Chairman Beason convened the Nevada County Transportation Commission meeting at 8:30 a.m.

Pledge of Allegiance.

CONSENT ITEM

6. Certificate of Appreciation: Patti Ingram.

Vice Chairman Beason requested the Certificate of Appreciation for Commissioner Ingram be presented at the beginning of the meeting. He stated his personal appreciation for Commissioner Ingram's contribution and dedication through her work on the Grass Valley City Council, as well as the Nevada County Transportation Commission. Vice Chairman Beason read the certificate to Commissioner Ingram and the Commission.

1. Closed Session: Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957, Employee Performance Evaluation of the Executive Director, Daniel B. Landon.

Vice Chairman Beason announced the commencement of the closed session at 8:40 a.m. The Commissioners and Executive Director Landon went into a private conference room.

Vice Chairman Beason reconvened the NCTC meeting at 9:07 a.m. in the Council Chambers, after conducting an Employee Performance Evaluation of the Executive Director.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

2. Financial Reports

A. August and September 2006

There was no discussion on the Financial Reports.

3. Correspondence

- A. Letter from Metropolitan Transportation Commission - Response to NCTC regarding promoting telecommuting to reduce vehicle emissions which impacts ozone in the Sierras. 9/29/06, File 1030.2.4.2.

Executive Director Landon highlighted that in July 2006 the Commission directed staff to send letters to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG). MTC responded and indicated their support of the concept to reduce vehicle emissions. SACOG took the letter as informational and did not send a response, but their goals and work plan indicate some telecommuting and transportation demand management related strategies. Vice Chairman Beason stated there was a briefing on air quality a month ago at the Board of Supervisors meeting, and the presenter mentioned there were about 30,000 household members in Sacramento that are telecommuting. They believe the numbers are increasing for telecommuters.

- E. City of Grass Valley - Letter to David DuPell regarding the reimbursement agreement for Brunswick Road/Sutton Way intersection. ~~4/6/06~~, File 1030.3.2.2.

Vice Chairman Beason noted a correction to item 3E, indicating the date of the letter as 10/6/06.

4. Executive Director's Report

4.1 Status Report on the Dorsey Drive Interchange Project

Executive Director Landon reported there had been a project team meeting between the City of Grass Valley, Caltrans staff, Nevada County, and NCTC. Caltrans is working on the City's issues and concerns presented previously, and the project is moving forward.

Commissioner Brady asked when to expect feedback from Caltrans on the discussion points brought up regarding reducing the width of the overpass, merging Joerschke Drive, the height of the overpass, and the steep cut slopes. Executive Director Landon responded that preliminary information would be available by mid-December, with completion by mid-January 2007.

Vice Chairman Beason asked if there were to be any Traffic Model data changes, would it have a measurable impact on the Dorsey Drive Interchange planning process. Executive Director Landon responded that it would not.

4.2 Status Report on the SR 49 La Barr Meadows Road Signal and Widening Project

Executive Director Landon noted that the Caltrans District Director would not sign the Project Report until the Environmental Document was complete. The Federal Highways would not review the Project Report until the Director approved it. Mr. Landon said they have since worked through that issue, and the construction date is still May 2009. Caltrans is looking at funding alternatives to be sure the project is fundable. The passage of Proposition 1B opens doors to additional funding possibilities, which could total \$11 million for SR 49 when partnered with Caltrans funds.

Executive Director Landon said there is a new program called the Corridor Management Improvement Account that may be another source of funds for the SR 49 signal and widening project. Vice Chairman Beason asked if that was the program mentioned in the Sacramento Bee where the regional projects must be submitted by January 15, 2007. Mr. Landon affirmed that was

the same program, and he has a meeting with Caltrans District 3 Director Jody Jones on November 20th to strategize how to partner with them to go before the California Transportation Commission (CTC). He thought there would be two opportunities for SR 49: One is to be sure there is sufficient funds to construct the La Barr Meadows/SR 49 signalization and widening project; and two would be to encourage the state to begin looking at the entire SR 49 corridor again to see if the Environmental Document could be completed for the whole corridor.

4.3 Highway 49 Traffic Safety Committee

Executive Director Landon reported that the contract for the rumble strip project for SR 49 was awarded, but the contractor immediately requested Caltrans put a winter suspension on the project. Caltrans District 3 staff encouraged the contractor to find a way to construct the project this fall. However, given the temperature requirements for the placement of the rumble strip adhesives, it appears the project may have to wait until springtime and warmer weather.

Chet Krage, a member of the Citizens for Highway 49 Safety, mentioned that in their recent safety meeting they praised Caltrans for the work they have done recently. He cited the additional signage on the SR 49 corridor in both directions from the Combie/Wolf Road intersection up to the McKnight Way interchange in Grass Valley. There is now seven 55 mph speed limit signs and they are the larger size signs. Caltrans also put up "Cross Traffic Ahead" signs where appropriate. Mr. Krage reported that Caltrans will also consider using more of their SHOPP (State Highway Operations and Protection Program) safety funds for incremental small improvements along SR 49 in the future, as long as the project does not exceed \$1 million. The quick decision to construct the rumble strip was feasible due to the SHOPP funds available. Caltrans said they will work with local jurisdictions to construct improvements, such as passing lanes or climbing lanes that would enhance safety operations on that section of SR 49.

5. Caltrans District 3

A. Project Status Report

Winder Bajwa, Caltrans Project Manager for Nevada County, was unable to attend the meeting to present the updated information in his report.

➤ *Truckee SR 89 Mousehole*

Commissioner Susman reported that the informational open house held on September 27th in Truckee was well attended. He said there were handouts, Caltrans personnel were available to answer questions, and there were questionnaires to fill out. Everyone who filled out questionnaires received a thank you letter from Caltrans for attending.

B. SR 20 Accident Statistics

Robert Peterson, Caltrans Traffic Safety Engineer, prepared a traffic safety report on SR 20, as requested by Commissioner Sutherland at the September 20th NCTC meeting. However, the Caltrans representative was not in the audience when the item was introduced.

CONSENT ITEMS

7. Certificate of Appreciation: Robin Sutherland. *Commissioner Sutherland was not in attendance to receive her Certificate of Appreciation.*
8. NCTC Minutes: September 20, 2006. *Approved.*
9. NCTC Minutes: October 4, 2006. *Approved.*

Commissioner Susman made a motion to approve the Consent Calendar. Commissioner Steele seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

ACTION ITEMS

10. Regional Transportation Mitigation Fee (RTMF) Update - Consulting Contracts

Executive Director Landon reported that at the July 19, 2006 NCTC meeting the Commissioners directed staff to develop a Request For Proposal to seek a consultant firm to update the RTMF, and Commissioner Ted Owens requested staff come back to the Commission if the proposed cost exceeded the approved \$80,000 budget. Mr. Landon reported the selection committee recommended three firms to complete the update, utilizing each firm's specialized experience and technical competence. Fehr and Peers would complete the modeling and Capital Improvement Program (CIP) review. Mark Thomas and Company would prepare the cost estimates for the CIP projects. Parsons Brinckerhoff would conclude the process by providing methodologies for allocating mitigation fees and prepare the nexus study. Mr. Landon stated it was up to the Commission if they would approve contracts with the three entities, and approve the total cost of approximately \$133,000.

Commissioner Steele questioned if one of the contractors would take the lead on the project to be sure the work is completed in a timely fashion. Executive Director Landon responded that he would be the Project Manager. He said the first task would be for PRISM Engineering to provide the modeling information to Fehr and Peers, who would then complete the model review and the development of the CIP. That work would then be given to Mark Thomas and Company to do the cost estimates. Parsons Brinckerhoff would then receive all the data. Mr. Landon said there is a project schedule and he will oversee the accomplishments and coordination of tasks.

Commissioner Steele asked how the broadband impacts would be considered in this model. He reported county government is spending a lot of money for e-government, and Nevada County exceeds many other counties with telecommuting numbers. He said AT&T is promising additional DSL services in the county before 2007, and they have added more remote terminals and fiber optics. Executive Director Landon said because all these things are in the future, they are difficult to predict, but he thinks it will address itself as the county moves forward with e-government activities. As traffic counts are monitored, there should be a reduction in the count over time. He thought the broadband numbers would be implemented into the RTMF program when a development proposes a facility and they either put equipment in the building or employ strategies to accomplish and document trip reductions; then there could be some consideration in the fee application and a break in the fee. Commissioner Steele understood that for new construction, but he brought up homes already constructed that would use telecommuting as an alternative to transportation, and he does not feel that factor is being taken into consideration.

Vice Chairman Beason asked if the people telecommuting in Nevada County are increasing trip counts locally to and from businesses such as Federal Express. Commissioner Susman stated he

thought the margin of error in the traffic modeling would absorb the telecommuters, so his opinion was to move forward with what is there now.

Commissioner Steele said he thought it was a great idea to merge the expertise of the three companies to complete the update process. Commissioner Brady agreed that we have the best of the best to update the RTMF, and he thanked Tim Kiser for the idea and Executive Director Landon for carrying out the plan. Commissioner Harris commented that she shared Commissioner Steele's concerns of how to coordinate three firms, but she has confidence in Mr. Landon's abilities to coordinate the process. She asked Mr. Landon how he proposed to keep the project on schedule so at week 29 everything will be complete. Executive Director Landon replied that his approach was to ask each firm for their targeted timeline. Then he would have no problem insisting they perform to the schedule they have set for themselves. He commented that if the stakeholders have issues that delay the process, he would bring the consultant(s) in front of the Commission to inform them. Vice Chairman Beason asked if the three consultants agreed to the sharing process and the schedule. Mr. Landon replied yes and that he sent each firm the initial schedule, and the timeline was adjusted to allow adequate time for each firm to complete their part of the update.

Vice Chairman Beason asked if there were sufficient funds in the RTMF account to cover the additional costs, since at the October meeting Mr. Landon's calculations indicated that the \$80,000 proposed would be the limit. Executive Director Landon explained that there is sufficient cash on hand and, by doing the comprehensive RTMF update, the fees will be increased and the cost to do this update will be included in the increased fee.

Commissioner Brady made a motion to approve Resolution 06-32. Commissioner Ingram seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

16. Brunswick Road/Sutton Way Intersection Improvements

Vice Chairman Beason requested this item be agendaized and asked that it be discussed prior to Item 11, the proposed interim fee. He explained that he is not asking the Commission to rescind the increase of funds for the Brunswick Road/Sutton Way Intersection, but to suspend the process until it is clear what the ultimate design will be at the intersection and how it will be funded. He said there is a question in his mind about available funding from the project applicant. Vice Chairman Beason said he has struggled with the decision made at the October 4th NCTC meeting to double the RTMF funds toward this project, knowing that there could be additional improvements needed when Walgreens or another business goes into the Jim Keil Chevrolet location. He also questioned if it would be advisable to reevaluate the design one more time with Caltrans at the policy level.

Commissioner Ingram said that according to the two letters stating legal opinions, the idea of rescinding or postponing the project have the same outcome, which is the project does not get built. She stated the City of Grass Valley attorney and the NCTC attorney communicated concern that either action could cause issues for one or both organizations. She does not believe that NCTC has the authority to rescind or postpone a project that is required by CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act). Vice Chairman Beason stated that a question that has not been answered is the contract was signed in January 2005, with the recognition that Caltrans had entered the picture and had laid some additional requirements on the project applicant; but the issue of the increased cost of the project did not come to the NCTC until September 2006. He agrees that the project has to be done. He is just questioning the timing of when it will be built, based on the new circumstances of Jim Keil and Ralphs having moved out of their locations, and the change in traffic load. Vice

Chairman Beason and Commissioner Susman both agreed that an occupancy permit should not have been issued without the mitigation being built. Commissioner Susman suggested that further discussion on this matter should possibly be held in a closed session with both attorneys present. Vice Chairman Beason stated he thought it would not be necessary to involve attorneys, but he would like to be prudent with and accountable for how the RTMF money is spent.

Commissioner Steele said he would like to know what Caltrans management thinks of the design that their engineer said would not work. Commissioner Ingram said that a decision has been made on this subject and a motion was passed on October 4th. Her suggestion was if someone wanted to make a motion to do something other than what was passed on October 4th, that action needed to happen now. Vice Chairman Beason wanted to hear other Commissioner's opinions.

Commissioner Brady said that initially he thought it was a creative solution for Grass Valley to allow Big One Appliance to move forward. But now that the project has doubled in cost and the way it has played out with the NCTC and Caltrans, there is reason to have a discussion to give a recommendation to the cities and county of how to handle these types of projects in the future. He said the project was moved forward out of sequence. Now the cost has doubled, and Jim Keil Chevrolet moved out. Commissioner Brady asked if the intersection has been designed correctly for what the next improvement level would be at that corner. He asked if it is fair to ask staff to bring back either from the City of Grass Valley or the County a report that confirms that the intersection, as planned, would serve the future development of the Keil property, the increase growth of Sutton Way, and that it is not just a reaction to this one development. Commissioner Ingram reminded the Commission that the intersection is now in the city limits, and is no longer under the County jurisdiction. Vice Chairman Beason said he appreciated Commissioner Ingram's position, but his proposal was to suspend the process to get better information.

Tim Kiser, City of Grass Valley Engineer, responded to the question if the proposed improvements would help the existing conditions as originally designed with the Chevrolet dealership there. He said yes, it would help. To the question, "Would additional improvements be needed," he responded possibly. Mr. Kiser said they will look at which businesses go in there, but that could be ten years from now. He said if a car dealership goes into the Keil property, or if Safeway does not expand Ralph's store or their services, there would be no additional trips or revenues. He reported that Walgreens indicated that they would have no additional impact at that intersection. They contend that they could control the traffic through signal timing to mitigate any traffic from their business. Mr. Kiser said any thoughts about future planning for the intersection are only speculative. He also said that CEQA is a real issue for the City of Grass Valley, and if improvements are not made as stated the City is putting itself at risk. The City Attorney also indicated that future RTMF fee collection is at risk because they have identified the intersection and collected fees for it for several years. His interpretation of the lawyers' letters state any delay in the project is an issue with CEQA.

Vice Chairman Beason said the contract was signed in January 2005 and almost two years later the cost has nearly doubled. He asked for an explanation of the delay. Tim Kiser said the City met with Caltrans initially to widen Brunswick with an additional left turn lane. The owner of Jim Keil Chevrolet was not willing to provide right-of-way at that time, so they came up with another workable design that Caltrans was willing to accept that would improve the level of service at the Brunswick Road/Sutton Way intersection. Mr. Dupell had to do a new design and resubmit it for review and approval. Vice Chairman Beason asked for insight from Executive Director Landon as to why there was such a huge gap of time between the second design submission and where the project is today. Mr. Landon responded that NCTC staff only saw invoices to reimburse for the

work being done and he was not involved in the design process, so he does not know specifics of what took so long to complete the design phase. Tim Kiser replied that some of the issues were that the design consultant did not align the road correctly, as far as the two Sutton segments; they had cars from the south side of Sutton crossing over Brunswick and running into a sidewalk. So they had to realign the sidewalk. There were also crosswalk issues that needed to be addressed, and some timing issues.

Vice Chairman Beason asked if the easement land requested previously were to be available now, would it reduce the cost of the project. Tim Kiser responded that the easement land was to be used on the first project, not the pending project. Also, because Walgreens says there is no additional traffic impact with their project, they would probably not be willing to give the city the easement anyway. Vice Chairman Beason said he would like Walgreens, or any other business, to prove that they have no additional impact at that intersection.

Commissioner Harris shared her distaste for wasting public money by building an improvement that possibly two years down the road would need to be completely redone. But she believes it is key that there is no way to predict what would go into that location, and the property could just sit there. She believes the Commission needs to move forward and meet its obligation, and hopefully learn from this so it does not happen again.

Vice Chairman Beason asked Executive Director Landon what happens if the money from the applicant is not there to build the project now. Mr. Landon responded that this would be speculation, but there would be a compliance issue with the terms of the agreement if the applicant would not be able to fulfill his part of the agreement. One of the clauses in the contract indicates that, in the event the applicant cannot perform, the City of Grass Valley would take charge of the project and move it forward.

Vice Chairman Beason said it appeared there was no motion forthcoming to put the RTMF payment on hold until the Commission could get a better sense from Caltrans. No further action was taken on the Brunswick Road/Sutton Way Intersection project.

Vice Chairman Beason would like the record to show that he believes potentially that the Commission is subject to more severe criticism for spending this kind of money on the improvement at this intersection than they are under CEQA. He thinks the CEQA issue occurred when the contract was signed.

11. Proposed Modifications to the RTMF Capital Improvement Program and Adoption of An Interim Fee

Executive Director Landon explained that at the October 4th NCTC meeting there was discussion regarding the possibility of recommending an interim fee while the RTMF Update is in process. The Commission listed three premises to establish a proposed interim fee:

1. Include the adjustment of the Capital Improvement Project (CIP) costs, based on the Engineering News Record Construction Cost Index.
2. Include the budgeted cost of consultants for the RTMF Update into the CIP.
3. Include the additional allocation of \$314,000 for the Brunswick Road/Sutton Way Intersection Improvement into the CIP.

Mr. Landon directed the Commissioners to documents that showed what the fee would be, and the possible revenue amount that would be collected by the interim fee, based on the schedule proposed for the update process. He said the bottom line showed that there could be an interim amount collected from \$28,400 up to \$63,900, assuming the update fee is adopted in August 2007.

Commissioner Ingram asked if this addressed the inequities between commercial and residential. Mr. Landon said this does not go into geographic distribution or commercial/residential issues.

Commissioner Brady said what is expected from the RTMF Update is to build into the final product an annual update of the fee, so it matches the inflation index. He is hoping the new update will be an accurate representation of the fees to be collected for the improvements needed in the County. Commissioner Brady stated that he is in favor of the interim fee, since the RTMF Update will not be completed and approved for about ten months, and he thinks the RTMF projects need the additional revenue. He believes it is a fair way to increase the fee.

Commissioner Ingram said she thinks it is better to collect money in the interim, but she is still concerned about the collection of fees for residential and nonresidential not aligning fairly.

Barbara Bashall, Executive Director of the Nevada County Contractors' Association, expressed her frustration of the RTMF program. She is pleased that the three consultants will be hired to revise and update the program. She does not like the collection of money without building the improvements. She would like these issues looked at and included in the update to state a policy for future projects.

Commissioner Harris brought attention to page one of the proposed interim fee documentation where it states that the fee will go from a low of \$99,000 up to \$128,000. She said that inferred a 28% increase. Vice Chairman Beason said he went across all the zones and it averages out to a 43-44% increase. Executive Director Landon directed the Commissioners to Exhibit 4, and he reviewed the history of fee collection. He said when the fee was adopted in 2001, the average fee across all zones was \$357 per trip, and then the amount for each zone was assessed per trip. In 2004, when the last update occurred, the average fee was \$436, with Zone 8 being at \$630. The proposed interim fee would bring the average fee up to \$561 per trip, and Zone 8 would be \$830 per trip. Mr. Landon said Commissioner Harris was calculating for a percentage in total revenue and Vice Chairman Beason was looking at fees per trip, which is why the percentages came out different. Vice Chairman Beason said because there is not a split in fees collected between commercial and residential projects, this could cause the commercial developers to slow down or not do anything. He said two weeks ago it was thought the differences were going to be \$12,000 to \$30,000, but now it is \$24,000 to \$64,000. Commissioner Harris did not believe the increase would deter someone from building a project.

Chet Krage, a member of the public, pointed out that he thought Executive Director Landon gave an optimistic timetable of August 2007 for implementation of a permanent RTMF revision. He believed the three jurisdictions would need time to deal with the proposed update, and then there would be 60 days after adoption before the fee would take effect. He thought it would take between eleven months and one year to finalize the process. Mr. Krage asked if commercial builders construct a project outside of Zone 8, do they not get a credit on the fee. Mr. Landon responded that outside of Zone 8, under the current fee structure, a commercial project does not pay a mitigation fee. This is because it keeps residents shopping locally instead of traveling to Zone 8 to purchase.

Commissioner Susman said the interim fee is not addressing any of the issues regarding the RTMF; it is about not losing revenue through another building season until the RTMF Update can be finalized. He said the question at hand is whether or not to recommend the interim fee, and not a question if the fee is accurate. He added that the calculations are based on sound considerations and it seems like a consistent increase, since the process for collection is not being modified. Commissioner Susman remarked that what is the value of \$68,000 if the Commissioners are wrestling with the dollar amount, or what the political outcome or emotional outcome might be versus leaving it at the status quo for another nine months.

Commissioner Ingram stated she has questioned herself as to what the appropriate thing would be to do. She said if the interim fee is adopted now, then it would not be such a shock when the fee jumps up even higher to the final adopted amount at the conclusion of the RTMF Update process. She would like to appropriately represent the City of Grass Valley when she knows there is construction taking place, and she would like to see the City collecting fees toward the RTMF CIP projects.

Vice Chairman Beason asked if there were not a need to pay the additional \$314,000 for the Brunswick/Sutton Intersection project, would there be a need for the interim fee increase. Several of the Commissioners said yes, absolutely. He also questioned about the Idaho-Maryland Road/East Main Street intersection and an RTMF increase. He asked if the terms of that agreement were worked out yet. Executive Director Landon responded that in April 2006 the Commission acknowledged the City of Grass Valley's desire to list this project at a higher cost, and indicated that it would be a part of the comprehensive update of the RTMF. He said the time frame for details of a loan from the City's account being paid back by RTMF was not worked out. Mr. Landon explained that when doing the calculations for this interim fee, he acknowledged that the City would use the \$781,000 that they were holding in their RTMF Reserve, and then acknowledge that the loan was planned.

Vice Chairman Beason stated that he is torn between the idea that the more the fees are increased, the more things cost. On the other hand, if the fees are not increased, then people are not paying the money that should be paid toward the RTMF projects. He also thinks Commissioner Ingram made a compelling point in terms of residential and nonresidential fee collection not aligning fairly.

Commissioner Steele stated that he is not in favor of the interim fees. He would like to see the RTMF program corrected and redefined, especially the discontinuity between what commercial pays and what residential pays. He would like to see that issue resolved first. He does not think the fees should be increased just because they will eventually increase. Commissioner Steele would rather see a solid program go forward once the update is completed. He does not think the interim fees are on solid ground because it is based on a set of assumptions.

Commissioner Brady said the difference between residential and nonresidential fee collection was one of the main questions posed to the firms during the interview process of proposed RTMF Update consultants. Interviewers questioned what the consultant's findings were in other jurisdictions. The consultants responded that residential was more strongly mitigated, and the residential is the precursor to the traffic and not the commercial. They said the commercial was a result of the growth in the residential. He is looking forward to how they will approach the proportionality of the zones; whether they will recommend discontinuing zones or decrease the number of zones. Commissioner Brady stated that the fee structure the consultant proposes would be substantially higher than what we have currently. His opinion is that the RTMF Program has been undercollecting for years,

because there has not been enough money to build the projects. He believes the interim fee would be seen as a baby step once the final fee is brought forward. He stated that not having an inflation indicator for a yearly increase on the RTMF Program was a mistake. He sees the interim fee more as a yearly update to the fee program based on inflation only, and he would not like to see a loss of those funds.

Commissioner Harris made a motion to adopt Resolution 06-33. Commissioner Susman seconded the motion. Vice Chairman Beason requested a roll call vote. Staff polled the Commissioners in attendance and Commissioners Susman, Harris, Brady and Ingram voted in favor of the motion. Commissioners Beason and Steele voted to not adopt the resolution. The motion passed four to two in favor of approving modifications to the RTMF CIP and adopting Resolution 06-33 to recommend an interim fee be adopted by the western county jurisdictions.

Vice Chairman Beason recessed the NCTC meeting at 10:32 a.m. to allow the Transit Services Commission to convene in order to conduct an Unmet Needs Public Hearing scheduled for 10:30 a.m.

* Commissioners Susman and Brady left the NCTC meeting at this point.

Vice Chairman Beason reconvened the NCTC meeting at 11:35 a.m.

12. Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC)

Michael Woodman, Transportation Planner, explained that due to vacancies on the SSTAC, he made an effort to seek individuals who may be interested in participating. He stated that notices were posted in The Union and Sierra Sun newspapers, and he also sent out notices to individuals listed on the SSTAC mailing list. One application was received from David Soto, who is a Senior Program Manager for the Area 4 Agency on Aging. Mr. Woodman stated that staff's recommendation was to appoint David Soto to the SSTAC as a representative of potential transit users who are age 60 years or older.

Commissioner Harris stated that Mr. Soto seemed well qualified, but that he did not live in Nevada County. Commissioner Ingram asked if he would be paid mileage to attend meetings, and Mr. Woodman responded no. Commissioner Harris questioned how Mr. Soto could speak to the transit needs of this age group if he is not a part of the community. Mr. Woodman replied that it is fairly unusual for someone that lives outside of the county to be a representative on the SSTAC. In previous discussions with Mr. Soto, Mr. Woodman said he was aware of issues in Nevada County because of his representation on Area 4 Agency on Aging. Mr. Woodman said the appointment is for a three-year term.

Commissioner Steele commented that Mr. Soto is listed on the SSTAC for Sacramento County, Sutter County, and Yuba County. Vice Chairman Beason questioned how often the SSTAC meets, and Mr. Woodman responded that they meet two to three times a year for unmet needs. Commissioner Harris read under compliance on page two of the handout, "One representative of potential transit users who are 60 years of age or older," and she said Mr. Soto is not a potential transit user in Nevada County. She asked Mr. Woodman if he had contacted the Senior Center for a possible candidate. Mr. Woodman was unsure if they were on the SSTAC distribution list, but he noted there was a notice in The Union newspaper.

Mr. Woodman stated the reason Mr. Soto was considered for the position on SSTAC was due to his employment at the Area 4 Agency on Aging. Vice Chairman Beason said the last survey done by Area 4 Agency on Aging in Nevada County revealed that seniors felt transportation was the highest priority, but it does not seem like there is anyone locally who would want to step forward to help. He agreed with Commissioner Harris that it might be wise to recirculate the application for the openings.

Michael Woodman said there are still several vacancies on the SSTAC, and NCTC staff plans to continue to work with representatives in the community to fill those. He said it has been particularly hard to fill the two vacancies in Truckee. Commissioner Steele asked if anyone has ever gone to the Senior Center and given a presentation to tell seniors why this is an important role. He suggested holding a meeting at the Senior Center. Mr. Woodman said that Harriet McKay held this position for many years, so he had not pursued recruiting there previously.

Mr. Woodman suggested the Commission appoint Mr. Soto since more than one person can be appointed to a given category. If others in the community are interested, they could also be appointed. Vice Chairman Beason asked if there were grant issues involved with the membership. Mr. Woodman responded there were no grant issues. In terms of conducting the unmet needs process, he said it is beneficial to have as many members on the SSTAC as possible to provide input for the unmet needs process. It was verified that the parties listed in the memo are currently serving on the SSTAC and are not up for reappointment. Vice Chairman Beason said Lynn Jefferson is now working for the County, so he questioned if that disqualifies her. She is still in Social Services. Mr. Woodman will check into it.

Commissioner Ingram recommended staff continue recruiting, especially at the Senior Center, instead of choosing Mr. Soto now. Executive Director Landon noted that if Mr. Soto were chosen, it would not preclude someone from the Senior Center being added. Mr. Landon also mentioned that since Area 4 Agency on Aging handles grants for seniors, it would be of value to have the agency aware of the needs in Nevada County.

Commissioner Ingram made a motion to appoint Mr. Soto to the SSTAC. She also requested that staff pursue an appointment from the Senior Center. Commissioner Steele seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

13. Nevada County Economic Resource Council (ERC)

Executive Director Landon reported that the Commission has received a request from the ERC to consider membership on their board. NCTC staff is in support of this action. Commissioner Steele has been involved in the meetings as a public member.

Commissioner Steele commented that it is important to have transportation and economic development partner together since they are two interlocking entities. He sees this as an opportunity to come up with solutions for local issues. Vice Chairman Beason mentioned there are three cities and the county represented on the ERC currently, and he wondered if they are not transmitting the information among the people well enough. Commissioner Ingram stated that the City of Grass Valley's representative is Joe Heckel, not an elected official.

Commissioner Steele felt to keep an overlap from happening for a given jurisdiction, it would be best to have the two At-Large Commissioners represent the Transportation Commission.

Commissioner Harris stated that it was a good idea and there was a need to put the two entities of transportation and business together.

Commissioner Harris made a motion to adopt Resolution 06-34, which authorizes the Executive Director to include the annual ERC fee into the Overall Work Program. The motion also appointed Commissioner Steele to represent the Commission on the ERC, and Commissioner Brady to be the alternate. Commissioner Ingram seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

14. NCTC Meeting Schedule for 2007

Executive Director Landon noted that with the regularly scheduled meetings every other month, it allows time to call special meetings as needed. Vice Chairman Beason stated that he supports having nine meetings a year, skipping April and August and December. His concern is the two-month hiatus between meetings. Commissioner Steele said when there is a need for a special meeting it is organized. He said the work staff does to prepare for a meeting is extensive and repetitive, and he is looking at the impact on staff and their ability to do the other things requested by the Commission when there are only six meetings a year. Commissioner Harris asked if there is a problem getting a quorum when a special meeting is called. Executive Director Landon replied that it has not been a problem in the past.

Commissioner Harris made a motion to approve the 2007 NCTC Meeting Schedule. Commissioner Steele seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

15. Authorization to Purchase Computer Equipment

Executive Director Landon reported that staff solicited quotes from several companies to be sure the budget listed on the memo is an accurate estimated cost for the types of computers needed for staff. Once the purchase is approved, staff will then get a quote to purchase two desktop computers since computer prices change rapidly. Staff will get the best price on the market for the needed equipment.

Commissioner Steele made a motion to approve the purchase of two desktop computers for NCTC staff. Commissioner Harris seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

COMMISSION ANNOUNCEMENTS

Commissioner Harris thanked Executive Director Landon for his help on Nevada City's successful passing of Measure S. She said he was generous in his knowledge and information, and the Town of Truckee also was a big help sharing what they experienced in getting their sales tax measure passed, and what they would have done differently. Commissioner Harris extended an offer of help to the City of Grass Valley, if they are considering proposing another sales tax measure; 57% was a good indication that people wanted the improvements.

Vice Chairman Beason congratulated Nevada City and the key members of the group who helped to get Measure S passed. He said they did a great job in educating the public and focusing on the problem.

Commissioner Steele said he thought what was done in Nevada City should become a model of the way to get sales tax measures passed.

Commissioner Ingram also commented on the excellent work Nevada City did. She believes the Committee for Measure T could have gone door-to-door to personally educate the public on the advantages. Commissioner Ingram announced that the Grass Valley City Council had two special meetings and gave authorization for South Hill Village and Loma Rica Ranch to move forward with their application to be annexed into the City, and to start moving forward with their Environmental Impact Report. She also reported that on November 28th there would be a Dorsey Drive Update regarding the information Tim Kiser provided Caltrans pertaining to lane width and what Grass Valley would like to do to keep the scope more realistic to our community. There will also be an update on the Idaho-Maryland/East Main Street corridor and Caltrans' approval for that project.

Commissioner Harris commented that Executive Director Landon could ask to put the interim fee proposal on the November 27th or 28th Nevada City Council Meeting agenda.

Commissioner Steele reported that the ERC is working to get a member of the County staff, Steve Monaghan, on the Governor's Broadband Task Force. He said the application went in on Monday, but the decision as to who will be on the task force will not come until December. The ERC is hoping for rural representation.

Vice Chairman Beason referred to an article in that day's *The Union* newspaper regarding North San Juan. The Board of Supervisors is working to make some progress on long overdue issues to make that a viable community where people can feel safe.

Vice Chairman Beason thanked Commissioner Ingram again for her hard work, insight, patience, and thoughtfulness while serving on the Transportation Commission. Commissioner Steele said the Commission would miss Commissioner Ingram's counsel.

SCHEDULE FOR NEXT MEETING

The next Commission meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 17, 2007 at 8:30 a.m., at the Nevada City Council Chambers, 317 Broad Street, Nevada City, CA.

ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

Vice Chairman Beason adjourned the meeting at 11:48 a.m.

Respectfully submitted: _____
Antoinette Perry, Administrative Assistant

Approved on: _____

By: _____
Chairman
Nevada County Transportation Commission